EXHIBIT A

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	FRANKLIN BROCKWAY GOWDY, State THOMAS D. KOHLER, State Bar No. 2079 STEVEN R. DANIELS, State Bar No. 23539 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP One Market, Spear Street Tower San Francisco, CA 94105-1126 Tel: 415.442.1000 Fax: 415.442.1001 MICHAEL J. LYONS, State Bar No. 202284 DAVID C. BOHRER, State Bar No. 212397 STACEY E. STILLMAN, State Bar No. 197 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 2 Palo Alto Square, Suite 700 3000 El Camino Real Palo Alto, CA 94306-2122 Tel: 650.843.4000 Fax: 650.843.4001 mlyons@morganlewis.com	17 98
11 12	Attorneys for Plaintiff Funai Electric Company, Ltd.	
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
14	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
15	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
16	Funai Electric Company, Ltd.,	Case No. C 04-1830 CRB (JL)
17	Plaintiff,	FUNAI ELECTRIC CO., LTD'S REPLY TO
18	VS.	DAEWOO ELECTRONICS CORP., ET AL.'S LETTER TO JUDGE BREYER REGARDING
19	Daewoo Electronics Corporation, Daewoo	SUPPLEMENTAL RECENT AUTHORITY REGARDING CLAIM CONSTRUCTION
20	Electronics Company, Ltd., Daewoo Electronics America, Inc., Daewoo	
21	Electronics Corporation of America, Inc., and Daewoo Electric Motor Industries,	Judge: Honorable Charles R. Breyer
22	Ltd.,	
23	Defendants.	
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
us &		

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW PALO ALTO

1-PA/3575099.1

REPLY TO DAEWOO'S LETTER TO JUDGE BREYER (C 04-1830 CRB (JL))

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

On January 18, 2006, this Court entered an order directing the parties to answer certain questions at the *Markman* hearing. Order Re: Markman Hearing [D.I. 225, entered January 18, 2006] (the "Order"). After the hearing, Defendants filed Daewoo Electronics Corp., et al.'s Letter to Judge Breyer Regarding Supplemental Recent Authority Regarding Claim Construction [D.I. 228, filed January 26, 2006] (the "Letter"), that purports to answer question one of the Order.

Question one of the Order asks Defendants:

Assume that "comprising . . . a" commonly means "one or more" when used to describe an element or list of elements in a claim term. Is there case law in the Federal Circuit that addresses whether that common meaning is altered if another element is modified by "at least one" or another modifier that indicates a quantity greater than one?

Order at 1:22-26. Defendants' letter contends that *Norian Corp. v. Stryker Corp.*, 432 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2005) is such a case. It is not.

Norian does not address whether the common meaning of the phrase "comprising ... a" may be altered by other claim language because the language "comprising ... of" was not in the claim under consideration. Rather, Norian interprets a claim that includes the phrase "consisting of." Norian, 432 F.3d at 1357. This phrase has the opposite common meaning to "comprising ... a" which commonly means "one or more." In particular, in Norian, the Court notes that "a" is generally interpreted in "its singular sense, when, as in this case, it has been used in conjunction with the closed transitional phrase 'consisting of." Id. at 1359. Accordingly, the answer to the Court's question one is that Defendants have not found any case law where a claim that uses the language "comprising ... a" is limited to one and only one for the reasons argued by Defendants.

Norian is also inapposite because the Court found in that case that a singular interpretation of "a" was "consistent with the specification, as the district court ruled." *Id.* In the current matter, however, Plaintiff has shown that the specification and the supporting figures are consistent with the broader "one or more" interpretation. *See* Pl.'s Opening Claim Construction Br. at 20-23 [D.I. 110, filed July 21, 2005] and Pl.'s Reply In Support Of Its Opening Claim Construction Br. at 11-13 [D.I. 130 filed August 24, 2005].

Morgan, Lewis &

1	Given that Defendants can find no support in <i>Norian</i> – or in any other case – to support
2	Defendants' interpretation of "comprising a capacitor," the Court should adopt the generally
3	accepted broad definition of "one or more" that is supported by the specification of the '218
4	patent.
5	
6	Dated: February 8, 2006 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
7	FRANKLIN BROCKWAY GOWDY DAVID C. BOHRER
8	MICHAEL J. LYONS THOMAS D. KOHLER
9	STACEY E. STILLMAN
10	
11	By /s/ Michael J. Lyons
12	Michael J. Lyons
13	Attorneys for Plaintiff Funai Electric Company, Ltd.
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1-PA/3575099.1